

Appl. No. 10/702,239
Arndt, Dated 6 February 2006
Reply to Office action of 13 December 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant appreciates the consideration shown by the Office, as evidenced by the Office Action, mailed on 13 December 2005. In that Office Action, the Examiner made final the restriction requirement; rejected claim 30 under 35 USC 103(a) on Charles US5165162 in view of Relis US2542057; and rejected claims 34-39 under 35 USC 103(a) on Charles in view of Relis and further in view of McLyman US4975672. After consideration of the Office Action, claims 45-46 have been canceled (claims 1-29 having already been canceled by preliminary amendment). Claims 30-44 remain in the Application with claims 30 and 34-39 being presently under consideration. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the above amendments and the following remarks offered in response to the Office Action.

Election Restrictions

Applicant notes that the species election/restriction requirement was made final. Applicant has canceled claims 45-46 and is maintaining claims 31-33 and 40-44 in "withdrawn" status in the event that generic claim 30 is held to be in condition for allowance.

35 USC 103 (a) - Claim 30

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 30 under 35 USC 103(a) over Charles and Relis. Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references do not teach, suggest, or disclose (either individually or in combination) the claim 30 recitations of (with emphasis added):

30. A toroidal winding assembly comprising: a winding core; and at least one electrical conductor wound around said winding core to form a longitudinal assembly; said winding core comprising a substantially non-ferromagnetic core material; and said longitudinal assembly being bent to form a generally toroidal assembly and having a first assembly end bonded to a second assembly end.

In addition to not describing the material of the core structure, Charles does not teach or suggest the above bolded language. Charles appears to relate to a toroidal assembly for an inductor with a magnetic material having gaps with spacers between various segments. There is no indication of the material comprising a longitudinal assembly being bent or a first end assembly bonded to a second assembly end. In Charles FIG. 4, a plurality of solid magnetic core segments are coupled with spacers, and no reference is made to a longitudinal assembly.

Relis was cited in the Office Action as showing a non-magnetic core. However, Applicant submits that even if a non-magnetic core is mentioned in Relis, the above bolded language is still not taught or suggested by any combination of Charles and Relis.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim 30 defines allowable subject matter over the applied art.

Appl. No. 10/702,239
Amdt. Dated 6 February 2006
Reply to Office action of 13 December 2005

35 USC 103 (a) - Claims 34-39

Claims 34-39 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on Charles, Relis, and McLyman. Each of claims 34-39 depends from claim 30 which Applicant believes to be in condition for allowance over Charles and Relis for the reasons discussed above. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully traverses several of the specific grounds for rejection of these dependent claims.

For example, although McLyman does appear to describe notches in FIG. 4, these notches are in the core itself and not in a winding support layer disposed on a winding core (as recited in claim 39).

Additionally, Applicant respectfully traverses the Office Action assertion that, regarding claims 36-38, the specific polymer would have been an obvious design consideration. Applicant submits that the embodiments of gelatin and ammonium dichromate (claim 36), polychloroprene (claim 37), and styrene-butadiene-styrene co-polymer (claim 38) are not simple design choices and instead are beneficial to the specific application claimed in Applicant's application. Applicants request that, if the Examiner continues to believe them to be obvious, the next office action include an additional reference and a statement as to the motivation for combining the additional reference.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 34-39 define allowable subject matter over the applied art.

Summary

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is needed to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

By Ann M. Agosti
Ann M. Agosti
Reg. No. 37,372
General Electric Company
Building K1, Room 3A66
One Research Circle
Niskayuna, New York 12309
Telephone: (518) 387-7713